

REMARKS

MPEP §§ 814 and 817 require that a restriction requirement include an identification of claims associated with each asserted species, and to identify those claim limitations that are associated with each species. In the Office Action dated August 5, 2010, the Examiner has improperly associated various figures with purported species, has failed to identify which claims are relevant to which figure(s), and has failed to identify which claim elements are associated with each species.

Regardless, for the purpose of expediting the prosecution of the present application, Applicant is making the present election of claims without traverse. Specifically, Applicant elects to continue the prosecution of claims 1-9 in the present application. A divisional application will be filed soon to continue the prosecution of claims 10-15. Other divisional applications may be filed in due course to pursue the remaining claims now withdrawn.

Application No. 10/588,165
Filed: April 02, 2008
TC Art Unit: 3752
Confirmation No.: 5155

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney to discuss any matter that would expedite allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,
Uri Arkashevski et al.

Dated: August 25, 2010

By: Gordon R. Moriarty/
Gordon R. Moriarty
Registration No. 38,973
Attorney for Applicants

WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN,
GAGNEBIN & LEBOVICI LLP
Ten Post Office Square
Boston, MA 02109

Telephone: (617) 542-2290
Telecopier: (617) 451-0313

GRM/laf/396193